

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 6 and 11 as the independent claims. It is gratefully acknowledged that in the Office Action, the Examiner maintained the allowability of Claims 15-18 if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Koster* (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,293) in view of *Giuhat et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,145); and Claim 11 as being unpatentable over *Mazzarella* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0107011) in view of *Himmel et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0134660).

An interview was held with the Examiner on March 1, 2007, during which Claim 11 was discussed and what amendments would put the claim into better condition for allowance. The Applicant sincerely appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in resolving the above issue.

The present invention discloses that a first mobile switching center (MSC) comprising a calling terminal detects an initial service provider of a called terminal from the called terminal information, not referring to the databases, whereas *Koster* discloses referring a number portability database (NPDB) and does not disclose detecting an initial service provider of a called terminal from the called terminal information. Because *Koster* fails to teach, disclose or fairly suggest the above recitations, *Koster* does not render the present invention obvious.

In addition, *Giuhat* discloses that a call is routed to a ported directory number even though a caller dials the called party number. *Giuhat* fails to teach that a network node is not created by a service provider as disclosed in claim 1 of the present invention.

Therefore, *Giuhat* does not disclose detecting an initial service provider of a called

terminal from the called terminal information, and transmitting the call request signal to a communication network formed by the detected initial service provider of the called terminal. Giuhat only discloses routing the call to the network node as the corresponding called party number. Accordingly, as Giuhat does not cure Koster's deficiency, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of independent Claims 1 and 6 be withdrawn.

Regarding independent Claim 11, it has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 12-15, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Thus, Claim 11 is further distinguished over the prior art of record.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 16-18, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 16-18 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-11 and 16-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8475
Fax: (516) 228-8476

PJF/EC